

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

LUIS ROBLES, et al.

Case No.
3:06cr120 (SRU)

CONFERENCE MEMORANDUM

On July 6, 2006, I held a status conference on the record with Gordon Hall and James Smart, representing the government, and Robert Gerard Golger representing Luis Robles, Robert A. Lacobell representing Raul Reyes, Frank J. Riccio and Frank J Riccio, II representing Abraham Pabon, Michael Moscowitz representing Walter Harrison, Lawrence S. Hopkins representing Wilfredo Martinez, Bruce D. Kofsky representing Ryan Persad, Donald J. Cretella, representing Robindranath Persad, Stephen M. Goldenberg representing Carlos Baez, Alexander H. Schwartz representing Zulma Matos, Todd Allen Bussert representing Jose Vargas, Francis L. O'Reilly representing Ignacio Vasquez, Elliot R. Warren representing Benny Rivera, and Robert M. Berke representing Isabel Pagan. The purpose of the conference was to discuss the status of the case.

A. Discovery

Attorneys Hall and Smart described the status of discovery. Significant discovery has been produced to defense counsel. The government is currently preparing additional materials and plan to disclose those materials to defense counsel as soon as they are completed. Hall estimated that those materials would be ready within the next.

B. Timeline and Speedy Trial Act

I also discussed the potential timeline of the case. Attorney Hall estimated that a trial for

two or three defendants would last approximately ten days. However, that estimate would increase if more defendants are involved in the trial. I set trial to begin on November 6, 2006 with jury selection on November 3, 2006. The proposed timeline would normally require waivers under the Speedy Trial Act, however, no party objected to a proposed order that would declare this case unusual and complex and exclude time from the Speedy Trial Act calculation. Finally, I set September 1, 2006 as the motion deadline. The government will then have twenty-one days to respond to any defense motion.

C. Motions

I also discussed pending motions with all parties. I granted the following motions: Isabel Pagan's Motion for Interim Payment (doc. #217); Carlos Baez' Motion to Seal (doc. #116); and, in light of the newly confirmed timeline, Abraham Pabon's Motion to Continue Jury Selection (doc # 218). I denied as moot all Motions for Waiver of Ten-Day Service. I also denied without prejudice substantially all other motions in light of the government's indication that discovery would be forthcoming. Additionally, I denied without prejudice Zulma Matos' Motion to Suppress Statements. At least one defendant intends to file a Motion to Suppress that may require an evidentiary hearing.

D. Printing Costs

Attorney Kofsky raised the issue of printing costs. In an effort to proceed in the most cost-effective manner, I proposed that the defendants who have not printed the discovery materials from the government disks should copy other defendants' materials to avoid duplicative expenses.

Finally, five defendants will require interpreters for any proceedings.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut, this 7th day of July 2006.

/s/ Stefan R. Underhill
Stefan R. Underhill
United States District Judge